REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed on July 26, 2002, claims 1, 4, 11-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Bohm; claims 3, 5 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohm in view of Yanai; claims 6, 9 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohm in view of Elabd; claims 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohm in view of Elabd and further in view of Yanai; and claims 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 3 and 8 have been amended to overcome the § 112 rejections. Newly added claims 18-21 are patentable over the cited art. The §§ 102 and 103 rejections are discussed in the corresponding sections below.

A marked-up version of the amended claims is submitted as a separate document. The undersigned has endeavored to ensure that the clean and marked-up versions of the amended claims correspond. However, the Examiner is specifically requested to verify that these two versions of the claims are consistent.

Rejections of Claims 1 and 3-5:

5

10

15

20

The imager of claim 1 includes an array of pixel sensors. For each pixel sensor, at least two storage locations are located in the array to store indications from the pixel sensor.

In contrast, Bohm discloses an image sensor that includes integrating devices labeled by reference numerals "8," "12" and "16." Bohm describes that at least two of these integrating devices are arranged in parallel so that these integrating devices measure at least two measured values during a measuring time, and Bohm describes that the integrating devices are allocated to different areas of the incident radiation spectrum. Bohm, Abstract. Thus, the integrating devices of Bohm must each include a pixel sensor to measure values from "different areas of the incident radiation spectrum" (i.e., measure different color components). However, Bohm neither teaches nor suggests that for any one of these integrating devices, its associated pixel sensor includes more than one storage device.

Thus, Bohm does not teach the limitations of claim 1. Claims 3-5 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

Rejections of Claims 6 and 8-10:

The camera of claim 6 includes an array of pixel sensors. For each pixel sensor, at least two storage locations are located in the array to store indications from the pixel sensor.

In contrast to the limitations of claim 6, Bohm neither teaches nor suggests at least two storage locations for a particular pixel sensor. In this manner, as discussed above in connection with claim 1, Bohm neither teaches nor suggests its integration devices include more than one storage location such that these storage locations are coupled to the same pixel sensor during different integration intervals.

Thus, Bohm neither teaches nor suggests the limitations of claim 6. Claims 8-10 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections and a favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance are requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0061US).

Date:

Respectfully submitted,

Fred G. Fruner Jr., Reg No. 40,77

TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.

8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100

Houston, Texas 77024

(713) 468-8880 [Phone]/(713) 468-8883 [Fax]

21906





CLAIM AMENDMENTS

RECEIVED

SEP 0 6 2002

Claims 3 and 8 have been amended as follows:

Technology Center 2600

- 3. (Amended) The imager of claim $\underline{1}$ [2], wherein the circuitry includes an analog-to-digital converter to convert the indications from the pixel sensor into a digital format
- 8. (Amended) The camera of claim $\underline{6}$ [7], wherein the circuitry includes an analog-to-digital converter to convert the indications from the pixel sensor into a digital format.